

**REMARKS**

Claims 3 and 8-12 were presented for examination in the present application and remain pending upon entry of the instant amendment. Claims 8 and 12 are independent.

Claim 8 was objected to due to obvious informalities. Claim 8 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Office Action, namely to change "massage" to "message". Applicants submit that this amendment merely makes explicit what had been implicit in the claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 8 are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as failing to fall within a statutory class. Claims 3 and 12 have been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner, namely to recite that the home page management server includes "a processor and a memory". Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3 and 12 are each clearly embodied as hardware elements. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8 and 12, as well as dependent claims 3 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Canadian Publication No. 20303466A1 to Loen et al. (Loen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 to Davis et al (Davis).

Applicants submit that clarified independent claims 8 and 12 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Independent claim 8 has been clarified as to the feature that the user terminal is "provided with a **web browser**" and that the home page management server transmits "HTML document data to the user terminal to provide the home page on the user terminal **in response to a transmission request of transmitting the HTML document data from the web browser** of the user terminal" (emphasis added).

The Office Action acknowledges that Loen fails to disclose a home page management server. Rather, the Office Action asserts that Davis discloses the claimed server.

However, and in contrast to clarified claim 8, Loen discloses that the user computer includes the web browser and the user computer accesses a remote computer. Further, Loen discloses that the web page is displayed on the user computer. See page 6, lines 11 to 18.

Thus, Applicants submit that the user terminal having a web browser as in clarified claim 8 is not disclosed or suggested by Loen. Davis fails to cure the aforementioned deficiency in Loen.

Applicants submit that the updating of a web page has two parts, namely, the first updating in which HTML document data themselves are updated, and the second updating in which banner data embedded in the HTML document data are updated, thereby updating the HTML document data.

In the interest of clarity, claim 8 has been clarified to recite that the web page is updated by either one of the updating parts. Specifically, claim 8 now recites that the patrol search unit patrols "the mail server, the update computer terminal, the home page data base and the schedule data base **in this order** (emphasis added)". Further, claim 8 has been clarified to recite that "the patrolling of the patrol search unit is finished **after first one of files** is searched (emphasis added)".

The Office Action indicates that Loen teaches a system which automatically updates a web page. In fact, this reference describes in its abstract, "The web page region is automatically updated when the source file is updated." Further, FIG. 1 of this reference illustrates a computer system 30, and FIG. 2 shows that the computer system 30 is connected via a network interface circuit 52 and a computer network 40 to a remote computer 50, and by utilizing a browser, a web page can accessed from the

remote computer 50. (See this reference, page 6, line 11 to 18.) With regard to this web page, this reference states "The web page is created by a web developer at remote computer 50 and is accessed by a use computer 30." (See page 6, line 17 to 18.) Moreover, FIG. 3 illustrates a method of creating a web page as a source file, and the structure of the web page is described with reference to FIGS. 4 to 21. Further, FIG. 22 shows an automatic updating method for web pages. As can be seen from FIG. 22, a browser is used to update a web page. (See page 10, line 5 to 12.)

As is clear from the above-provided descriptions, Applicants submit that Loen merely discloses a technique in which a web page is updated when the source file in the remote computer 50 is automatically updated. Loen fails to disclose or suggest the automatic updating of a web page in a server which provides the web page at all, wherein the remote computer 50 corresponds to the home page management server of claim 8. Thus, Loen does not disclose or suggest how to update the source file in the remote computer 50 at all.

Davis discloses, with reference to FIG. 4, that a web page is updated when web page revisions are received in e-mail. Further, this reference disclosed in its FIG. 5 that web page contents are updated when an e-mail message contains a content change. However, Davis also does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Loen.

Accordingly, claim 8, as well as claims 3 and 9-11 that depend therefrom are allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 3 and 8-11 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 12 recites a home page management unit that, **in response to a request from the web browser of the user terminal, reads** "the HTML data from the home page database", **issues** "a patrol search command to the patrol search unit to search and extract data relating to the banner HTML data from **the first request, the second request, and the schedule data**", **issues** "a banner generation command to

the banner generation unit to generate the banner HTML data based on the data", reads "the banner HTML data from the banner generation unit", appends "the banner HTML data to the HTML data", and transmits "the HTML data with the banner HTML data appended thereto to a user terminal" (emphasis added).


Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Loen and Davis fail to disclose or suggest the home page management unit that, in response to a request from the web browser of the user terminal, updates an entire web page by searching and extracting data relating to the banner HTML data from "the first request, the second request, and the schedule data" as recited by claim 12.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 12 is also allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 12 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for issuance. Such action is solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

August 31, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Charles N.J. Ruggiero  
Reg. No. 28,468  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401